



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,151	09/27/2001	Dwip N. Banerjee	AUS920010573US1	6245
35525	7590	02/03/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,151	BANERJEE ET AL.
	Examin r Dustin Nguyen	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/2001

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

I. the network - claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichiyoshi [US Patent Application No. 2001/0049088], in view of Grouse [US Patent Application No 2002/0156848].

6. As per claim 1, Ichiyoshi discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method comprising:

receiving a set of documents from a first client [i.e. educational materials] [col 2, lines paragraph 0014],

displaying the set of documents to at least one second client [i.e. subscriber] [5, Figure 1; and col 4, paragraph 0040];

receiving, from the at least one second client, a question relating to a section from the plurality of sections [Figure 6; and col 5, paragraph 0050];

receiving modifications from the first client [i.e. answer] [Figure 6; and col 5, paragraph 0050]; and

applying the modifications to the set of documents [col 1, paragraph 0004].

Ichiyoshi does not specifically disclose

wherein the documents include a plurality of sections; and

modifying the set of documents to include the question.

Grouse discloses

wherein the documents include a plurality of sections [i.e. topic] [Figures 18-20; and col 5, paragraphs 0071-0073]; and

modifying the set of documents to include the question [i.e. add questions to transcript] [col 2, lines paragraph 0016].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ichiyoshi and Grouse because Grouse's teaching of modifying the

documents would allow to provide further explanation and detail information to individual user in helping user to understand the document.

7. As per claim 2, Ichiyoshi discloses in response to receiving the question, alerting the first client [i.e. the information is transferred to the lecturer] [col 6, paragraph 0053].

8. As per claim 3, Ichiyoshi discloses the first client is alerted via electronic mail [col 6, paragraph 0052].

9. As per claims 7-9, they are program product claimed of claims 1-3, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-3.

10. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Ichiyoshi discloses a bus system, a processing unit, including at least one processor and connected to the bus system; memory connected to the bus system; and a set of instructions [Figure 5; and col 5, paragraphs 0046 and 0047].

11. As per claims 14 and 15, they are apparatus claimed of claims 2 and 3, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2 and 3.

12. As per claim 19, Ichiyoshi discloses the data processing system is connected to a network [Abstract, Figure 1].

13. As per claim 20, Ichiyoshi discloses the network is a wireless network [i.e. radio] [Figure 2; and col 1, lines paragraph 0002].

14. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichiyoshi [US Patent Application No. 2001/0049088], in view of Grouse [US Patent Application No 2002/0156848], and further in view of Sonnenreich et al. [US Patent No 5,974,446].

15. As per claim 4, Ichiyoshi and Grouse do not disclose the first client is alerted via instant message. Sonnenreich discloses the first client is alerted via instant message [col 6, lines 45-50]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ichiyoshi, Grouse and Sonnenreich because Sonnenreich's teaching of instant message would allow the users to interact with each other in real time.

16. As per claim 5, Sonnenreich discloses the documents are displayed in a web browser [col 2, lines 33-36].

17. As per claims 10 and 11, they are program product claimed of claims 4 and 5, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

18. As per claims 16 and 17, they are apparatus claimed of claims 4 and 5, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

19. Claims 6, 12, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichiyoshi [US Patent Application No. 2001/0049088], in view of Grouse [US Patent Application No 2002/0156848], and further in view of Boys [US Patent No 6,516,340].

20. As per claim 6, Ichiyoshi and Grouse do not specifically disclose the documents are displayed on a mobile computing device. Boys discloses the documents are displayed on a mobile computing device [i.e. wireless laptop] [col 13, lines 1-6]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ichiyoshi, Grouse and Boys because Boys' teaching of mobile computing device would allow information to be accessed from anywhere to add a level of portability to the system.

21. As per claim 12, it is program product claimed of claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.

22. As per claim 18, it is apparatus claimed of claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.

23. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Dustin Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2154